

Group I, claims 1-13, drawn to compounds in which n is 1; and

Group II, claims 1-13, drawn to compounds in which n is 2.

Additionally, after requiring applicants to choose one of Groups I and II, the examiner requires further restriction to one of:

Group A, claims 1-13, drawn to compounds in which Z comprises one ester group; and

Group B, claims 1-13, drawn to compounds in which Z comprises two ester groups.

In response to the requirement(s) as they are understood, applicants elect to prosecute the invention of Group I and Group A. However, applicants respectfully traverse the requirements in view of the following comments.

Initially, the first restriction requirement is not understood by applicants. More specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art will easily recognize that if we have a process to make derivatives of **monoamines**, then we are also able to derivatize **diamines**. Further in this regard, the examiner is respectfully directed to the International Preliminary Examination Report ("IPER") for the present application. As the examiner will see, the International Bureau and the PCT examiner did not have any problems with unity of invention. The only comment in the IPER relates to the fact that the Examiner believes the isomers of claims 2 and 3 may need to be defined. If the examiner intends to maintain this portion of the restriction, and in order to avoid a Petition to the Assistant Commissioners Office, further detailed clarification in support of the Examiner's position, in view of applicants' comments, is required and solicited.

Applicants are equally confused by the second restriction requirement. More specifically, one of ordinary skill in the art readily recognizes that in practice you get a

mixture of products that contain one or two ester functions. All products relate to each other in that they are the acid-complex or quaternized compounds resulting from the reaction of an amine (or diamine) with 1,2-epoxybutene. Because of the nature of the chemistry, you will always get mixtures of the isomers that can be formed in the process wherein the (di)amine reacts with the 1,2-epoxybutene. Accordingly, it is not possible and certainly not proper for the examiner to require applicants to restrict their claims to a certain category since one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that mixtures of quaternary ammonium compounds are obtained! In other words, contrary to the examiner's position of record, the claims DO, in fact, form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw both restriction requirements. In the alternative, if the examiner intends to maintain this portion of the restriction, and in order to avoid a Petition to the Assistant Commissioners Office, further detailed clarification in support of the examiner's position is clearly required and solicited.

Withdrawal of both restriction requirements and an action on the merits of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph J. Mancini
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,054

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5465